DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 272 936 CS 505 320

AUTHOR Tracey, Terence J.
TITLE Topic Following/Not Following as a Measure of Complementary/Symmetrical Communication.
PUB DATE Aug 85
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association (Los Angeles, CA, August 23-27, 1985).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Behavior Patterns; Behavior Theories; *Codification; Cognitive Processes; Communication (Thought Transfer); Communication Research; Counselor Client Relationship; *Interpersonal Communication; *Interpersonal Relationship; *Models; Psychological Patterns; Receptive Language; *Responses; Schemata (Cognition); Social Behavior; Social Theories; *Speech Communication; Stimuli; Symmetry
IDENTIFIERS *Complementarity

ABSTRACT

Communicative behavior conveys two messages: (1) content, and (2) how the recipient of the communication is to behave with regard to the content, or "relational communication." How the recipient responds to relational communication defines what form the relationship will take--either complementary or symmetrical. In a complementary relationship the two participants are unequal; one initiates action and the other follows. In a symmetrical relationship the participants are equal; each mirrors the behavior of the other. Complementarity and symmetry can be thought of as opposite ends of a relationship continuum, which should be considered when a coding process attempts to operationalize complementarity and symmetry. The current model of coding relational communication, which is based on the grammatical structure and response mode of a message, cannot adequately represent relationships on the complementarity/symmetry continuum. Therefore, the topic following/not following schema, designed in hopes of describing such relationships, uses the specific topic sequence as its basis of indicating complementarity/symmetry. Each speaking turn is rated as either a topic following response or a topic not following response, based on its relationship to the previous topic. Both coding systems are interactional in nature and the resulting codes are identical to a large extent; they will probably yield similar results except in less normal relationships, such as psychotherapy. (SRT)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED272936

Topic Following/Not Following as a Measure of Complementary/Symmetrical Communication

Terence J. Tracey
Department of Educational Psychology
University of Illinois at Urbana/Champaign

Running head: Topic following

Requests for reprints should be addressed to Terence J. Tracey, Dept. of Educational Psychology, 1310 S. Sixth St., Champaign, IL 61820.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Terence J. Tracey

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS 505 320

Abstract

The purpose of this paper is to review the current method of operationalizing relational communication and the related constructs of complementarity and symmetry, as well as to propose an alternative operationalization schema. The relational coding schema of Rogers and Farace (1975) is examined and found to rest on stereotypic conceptions of control which can be invalid in the psychotherapy context. Topic following/not following is proposed as an alternative to this schema because it focuses on who actually defines the interactions and further it is a more straightforward, parsimonious representation of complementarity and symmetry.

Topic Following/Not Following as a Measure of Complementary/Symmetrical Communication

One of the many contributions of the "Palo Alto" group that has received some attention in the psychotherapy field is the concept of relational communication and the associated constructs of complementarity and symmetry. These constructs have been used to describe what occurs in psychotherapy (Haley, 1963, 1980; Watzlawick, Beavin & Jackson, 1967; Watzlawick, Wenkland & Fisch, 1974), but relatively little research using these constructs has been performed. One of the reeasons for this relative dearth of research is the difficulty involved in operationalizing these constructs. In the past decade there have been several attempts at operationalization, noteably in the communications field (cf. Ericson & Rogers, 1973; Mark, 1971; Rogers & Farace, 1975; Sluzki & Beavin, 1977) but few applications to psychotherapy. The purpose of this paper is to review the major coding schema currently in the literature.

Relational Communication

Relational communication refers to that aspect of any communication in which control is expressed (Rogers & Farace, 1975). All communicative behavior carries two massages: one message that deals with content, i.e., the what or topic of the communication, and another message that deals with how the other person is to behave with regard to the content (Jackson, 1959). This second message, often called the command aspect (Watzlawick et al., 1967), is what is referred to by the terms relational communication. In every communication we are defining how we want the other participant to act (Watzlawick et al., 1967). How the other person actually responds to our relational communication defines what form the

relationship will take over time. The constructs of complementarity and symmetry are a means of describing any sequence of relational communication over time. A complementary relationship is one in which the two participants are of "unequal status in the sense that one appears to be in the superior position, meaning that he initiates action and the other appears to follow that action" (Jackson, 1959, p. 127). In this type of relationship the relational communication of one participant (here initiating any content--implying the other is to follow) is subsequently followed by the complementary relational communication of the other (following initiation--it's OK for you to initiate). Conversely, a symmetrical relationship is one in which there is an equal status among the participants; each mirrors the behavior of the other, particularly with regard to the relational level of communication. An example of this type of relationship would be a dyad where both participants follow one's initiation with another initiation. Each is communicating his/her right to initiate while not following the others relational message that the initiation is to be followed.

These concepts of complementarity and symmetry have been applied to both specific interactions between people (a behavior of one person immediately followed by a behavior by the other person) and to relationships between people. A complementary interaction would be one where one person "initiated" and the other person immediately "followed" the initiation. A symmetrical interaction would have the "initiation" not "followed" (or "reinitiated") by the other participant. Each participant would be "initiating". Similarly, using the concepts of complementarity and symmetry as descriptive of a relationship is a means of summarizing the different interactions over time. A complementary relationship would be one characterized by a preponderance of complementary interactions over

a time period. A symmetrical relationship would be characterized by symmetrical interactions. Given that relationship is here viewed as a descriptive summary of interactions over time, complementarity and symmetry can be posited as being opposite ends of a relationship continuum (Parks, 1977). This model appears plausible as one would expect a relationship characterized by all interactions being complementary to differ from a relationship characterized by, say 75% of all interactions being complementary. This assumption that complementarity and symmetry are opposite poles of a relationship continuum seems implicit in the literature but it has never really been explicitly stated. Complementarity and symmetry are always defined as discrete states but when applied, the relative nature becomes apparent. Any coding process that attempts to operationalize these concepts of complementarity and symmetry would, hopefully, enable the researcher to utilize this continuum concept.

Models of operationalizing complementarity/symmetry[1] are few. One reason for this paucity is that the concepts of complementarity and symmetry, as well as the different levels of communication, are very broad and "fuzzy". They were designed to be broad enough to be fairly universally applicable and meaningful. To be better able to study these concepts in a more "scientific" manner, researchers had to make certain assumptions regarding these concepts in order to find a means of operationalizing them. In addition, the process of operationalizing concepts requires certain compromises and choices be made by the researcher between the specificity and exactness of the dimensions measured and the ability to adequately represent the broader, "fuzzier" theoretical concepts. Each of the two coding schemas reviewed here will be examined according to the adequacy of the compromise reached between the validity of the

generalization to the construct and the exactness and completeness of the specifications. First, the relational coding schema will be briefly reviewed and examined, then the topic following/not following schema will be presented and evaluated.

Relational Coding

The current method of coding relational communication, here after referred to as relational coding in this paper, rests on Sluzki and Beavin's (1977) assumption that relational communication can be validly derived from the grammatical structure and response mode of a message. There are three highly similar models that use this assumption: Mark (1971), Ericson and Rogers (1973) and Roger and Farace (1975). The most recent model (Rogers & Farace, 1975) will serve as the basis of this brief review[2] as it is the most developed and well honed of the three.

This model of coding incorporates the interactional basis of behavior which is a cornerstone of relational communication. The unit of analysis is the paired verbal messages or utterances (all that one participant says followed by all that the other subsequently says). The behavior of one participant can thus not be coded without using the previous utterance of the other as a context. Each utterance is given a three digit code number. The code number incorporates the speaker (first digit), the grammatical form of the utterance (second digit) and the response mode of the utterance relative to the previous utterance (third digit). These codes are then translated into control dimensions, i.e., the assumed command aspect of the message, based on the grammar of the message and how it was related to the previous message. Those messages that suggested movement by one participant toward determining what is to occur

in the dyad were coded as one-up. Those messages that suggested movement toward seeking or accepting this definition were coded as one-down. Those messages that suggested neither of these control dimensions were coded as one-across. Given these directional codes (one-up, one-down, and one-across) of each message, sequential pairs of message units were examined together to determine the type of interaction that occurred. One-up followed by one-down (↑↓) and one-down followed by one-up (↓↑) were defined as complementary interactions. One-up followed by one-up (↑↑), one-down followed by one-down (↓↓) and one-across followed by one-across (→→) were defined as symmetrical interactions. Those interactions containing a single one-across move (↑→,↓→,→↑,→↓) were labeled as transitory interactions which were defined as having "a neutralizing or leveling effect on struggles of relationship definition" (Rogers & Farace, 1975). Given this coding schema one is able to monitor the sequence of interactions over time with respect to complementary, symmetrical and transitory interactions.

This model of operationalizing complementarity and symmetry is extremely valuable and noteworthy as an attempt at specifying very difficult concepts. The coding system itself is very complete in its exhaustiveness. It categorizes many verbal behaviors and then neatly translates them into control codes. This schema has been lauded for its novelty and potentiality (Wilder, 1979) and its merit has been demonstrated by its recent application to psychotherapy (cf. Lichtenberg & Barke, 1981). But, as alluded to earlier, this schema incorporates many choices and assumptions regarding the variables of interest. These choices and assumptions should be clearly understood so that the validity of the schema can be evaluated.

Once such choice that was made by the designers of this relational schema was to represent the relative nature of the concepts used at the interaction level rather than at the relationship level. Watzlawick et al. (1967) stated that in any complementary interaction there were two positions: one-up and one-down. These two positions are defined only relative to each other--one person defines the relationship to some extent and the other follows this definition to some extent. Rogers and Farace (1975) decided to interpret this relative power on an anchored continuum. They designed a middle, one-across category to encompass less extreme attempts at persuasion. This enabled them to represent the control attempts of each individual as a continuum. An individual message could be rated as attempting to assume a lot of control (one-up), some control (one-across) or little if any control (one-down). So the authors of this schema chose to focus most on accurately representing the continuum of control attempts. This model also translates well into a representation of the complementarity/symmetry continuum for single interactions. Transitional interactions (↑→ ,↓→ ,→↑ ,→↓) are somewhere between complementary interactions and symmetrical interactions. In a strict sense, all the transitional interactions can be said to be complementary because unequal control dimensions are present. In these transitional interactions, one person is "one-up" relative to the other but the degree of control expressed is less than in a clearly one-up statement of a complementary interaction (↑↓ or ↓↑). So this relational coding schema enables the user to get a picture of the continuum nature of complementarity and symmetry at the interaction level due to the presence of transitional interactions.

The problem with this schema is that it is extremely difficult to represent relationships, interactions over time, as a point on the comple-

mentarity/symmetry continuum. There is no guide as to how to combine the different types of interactions to yield an easily grasped index of complementarity. The difficulty arises when one tries to include transitory interactions. These interactions are viewed as less extreme than complementary interactions and it is unclear how to combine these interactions with complementary interactions over time to get a clear summary idex. Rogers-Millar and Millar (1979) found this to be a difficult problem to resolve. They used this relational coding model to compare domineeringness (control attempts) to dominance (actual control achieved) in married couples and relate these to satisfaction. Domineeringness was easily defined as the number of one-up attempts; but dominance was more difficult to define. They really wanted to get an index of how much of the time one person was in the one-up role of a complementary relationship. But this was hard to define because of the existence of the transitional category. To resolve this, they used three separate but overlapping indices; two of the indices using only pure ↑↓ complementary interactions and the third including relative complementary interactions (↑↓, →↓, ↑→). This decision to use three indices was based on there being no current rational or empirical way of including transitory interactions in an index. Using three overlapping indices makes it difficult to know what each is measuring and how it differs from the other indices. So, this relational coding schema is most advantageous in representing the continum of control attempts for single interactions, rather than the continuum of complementarity/symmetry for relationships.

Another choice made by the designers of this rating schema is that they chose to define one-up and one-down control attempts in culturally stereotypic ways. Watzlawick et al. (1967) state that "a complementary

relationship may be set by the social or cultural context (as in cases of mother and infant, doctor and patient, or teacher and student) or it may be the idiosyncratic relating style of a particular dyad" (p. 62). Messages that would typically be associated with a mother, teacher, doctor, or leader are defined as one-up, e.g., order, instruction, answer, talk-over, etc. Messages such as questions, support giving or seeking, and agreement, which could be said to be more characteristic of children, students, followers and patients, are defined as one-down. This culturally defined frame ensures that most readers will be able to readily understand the concepts of one-up and one-down. But as alluded to above, i.e., idiosyncratic relating style, these culturally proscribed definitions may not always be accurate especially if one is concerned with who actually defines the relationship. It is easy to recall occasions where peole have used stereotypic, "one-down" behaviors (e.g., questions of support or extension) to get the other participant to act in a complementary "one-up" manner (by answering, instructing or ordering). In the relational coding schema, the asker would be coded as one-down, while the answerer would be coded as one-up. If we were interested in determing who was dominant (i.e., who actually determined what occurred according to Rogers-Millar and Millar's, 1979, model), we would say the answerer was dominant because he/she was one-up. But was not the answerer acting according to the relational request of the asker? A key issue is who actually is exerting the control by defining how the two will interact and who is accepting the definition proposed (Watzlawick, 1964). In the above example, the asker of instruction was defining how the other was to act in the interaction--by giving the instruction. The other complied by giving the solicited instruction. The asker was thus actually "one-up" as he/she

successfully defined what occurred in the interaction. The answer was actually "one-down" because he/she followed this definition.

This "counter to cultural expectation" example of relational control has often been noticed in more therapeutically oriented fields. Haley (1980), commenting on the field of family therapy, states that "as problem young persons become more helpless and handicapped, they become more dominating in the family" (p. 82). Similarly, recent research in the area of leadership, an area traditionally focusing on control and power, has examined who actually determines what occurs in groups rather than who may appear to be or is named the leader (Gray, Richardson, & Mayhew, 1968; Lord, 1979; Mayhew, Gray, & Richardson, 1969; Stein, Hoffman, Cooley, & Pearce, 1979). So, the choice of defining one-up and one-down control attempts by stereotypic norms makes the concepts easily understood by all but moves away from a key defining aspect of complementarity and symmetry--that of who actually defines the interaction. This concept of who defines the interaction does not necessarily have anything to do with the relative "strength" or "weakness" of the behaviors of the participants because "weakness" can be used to define interactions (Watzlawick, 1964). By concentrating on defining one-up and one-down as somewhat similar to "strong" and "weak", the relational coding system leaves itself open to possible false conclusions of relational communication and complementarity and symmetry.

So, two important choices made in operationalizing complementarity/symmetry in this relational coding schema are the 1) focus on control moves and the resulting interactions instead of relationships, and 2) stereotypically defining one-up and one-down moves. The first choice of focusing on control attempts makes this model most applicable at the

molecular level of the interaction and less useful at the more molar level of the relationship. The second choice, stereotypic definition of control, makes the model easily understood by the reader but very prone to possible misinterpretation with regard to the theoretical dimensions it is said to represent. Regardless, the relational coding schema is a monumental attempt at defining and operationalizing, in a very complete way, the hard to grasp concepts of complementarity and symmetry. But, in hopes of describing relationships and focusing on who actually defines the relationship, the topic following/not followings schema was designed.

Topic Following/Topic Not Following Coding Schema

This coding schema uses the specific topic sequence as its basis of operationalizing complementarity/symmetry. Each speaking turn (i.e., all that is said by one participant between statements by the other) is rated as a topic following response or a topic not following response with respect to how it related to the topic of the previous speaking turn. A topic not following response (otherwise known as a topic initiation) is said to have occurred if the first topic of a speaking turn is different from the last topic in the immediately preceeding speaking turn in one or more of the following ways:[3]

a) different kind of content.

Example 1: Therapist: "sounds like parties are fairly threatening to you."

Client: "This is really a nice office you have."

A more subtle and common example is:

Example 2: Therapist: "How do you <u>feel</u> when your mother says that?"

Client: "I <u>think</u> she means well."

b) different person,

Example 3: Client: "My girlfriend really hates my doing that."

Therapist: "What do <u>you</u> feel about your doing that?"

c) different time reference,

Example 4: Client: "I really didn't get along well with my father when I visited this weekend."

Therapist: "What was your relationship like when you were young?"

d) different level of specificity.

Example 5. Client: "So when my boss said that to me, I didn't feel like talking to anyone."

Therapist: "Seems as though this fear and subsequent withdrawal are a pattern in all areas of your life."

If <u>none</u> of the above criteria are met by the speaking turn, it would be coded as a following response. As can be seen, the topic shifts being rated need not be obvious, abrupt jumps but can also be the more subtle type more typical in psychotherapy.

A special coding rule was developed for the presence of talkovers, i.e., when both participants were talking at the same time. It was found that when these occurred, it was typically impossible to decide where each speaking turn started and ended as well as who was saying what. Yet it was felt that these behaviors carried important relational control information and this should be accounted for. So topic following/not following was viewed, in this circumstance, with respect to who controlled the floor, rather than the topic. Specifically, a move by one participant to control the conversation by talking over the speaker would coded as a not following (initiating) response as the usual turn taking rule of discourse was

not followed. What the original speaker did in response to the interruption would determine whether or not his or her response would be coded as following or not following. If the original speaker yielded the floor to the interuptor, a following response would be given to the original speaker as the command aspect of the interuption (you keep quiet, I have something to say) was followed. If, on the other hand, the original speaker persevered and won the floor, the speaker would be credited with a not following response because the command message of the interuption was not followed.

Relationship of Topic Following/Not Following to Complementarity

The assumption inherent in this topic following/not following coding schema is that whether one follows the topic or not carries information regarding the command aspect of that utterance. It is assumed that if one participant initiates (i.e., not follows) a topic, the initiator is stating, at the command level, that he/she can control the interaction and that the other participant is to follow the initiated topic in a specific way. Thus, an initated topic (not following utterance) is viewed as similar to a one-up control move in this schema. On the other hand, a following response would not always be considered to be similar to a one-down move. A following response is only indicative of an acceptance of the command level message of the previous utterance. Given a topic initiation, a subsequent following response could clearly be considered a one-down move as the second participant is agreeing with the command level message of the initiation. This type of interaction, NF/F, would be considered complementary. But given a following/following interaction (F/F), the second following response could not equally be considered as being one-down.

This second following response would only represent an acceptance of what was previously accepted (the first F). In a sense, each participant would be endorsing the status quo of the relationship, whatever it was. If no one tries to change the process by initiating, each participant is assumed satisfied with the relationship as it is. The sequence of F/F represents each participant stating, at the command level, that he/she is happy with the interaction as it is. So the key concept in topic following/not following is how change attempts (initiations) are reacted to by the other participant. An initiation followed in time by a following response (NF/F) would be considered a complementary interaction as each person agrees at the command level that the initiator can determine the topic. An initiation that is subsequently not followed (NF/NF) would be categorized as a symmetrical interaction, as the second initiator does not agree at the command level that the first initiator has the right to determine what the topic is to be. Both participants engage in the same behavior. Given these definitions of complementary, symmetrical and status quo interactions, it is fairly easy to get an index of the complimentarity/symmetry in a relationship.

Topic determination (Tracey & Ray, in press; Tracey, Heck & Lichtenberg, 1981) is defined as the ratio of the number of NF/F interactions over the total number of not following utterances. The index of topic determination is descriptive of the degree of complementarity/symmetry in a relationship. A high degree of topic determination reflects a high degree of complementarity in the relationship as a high number of control attempts by one participant were accepted by the other. A low degree of topic determination reflects a low degree of complementarity (high degree of symmetry) as few initiations were followed and there is

thus little agreement on the command level of communication regarding who has the power to do what. This topic determination index can be derived for the relationship as a whole or for either of the participants to get an indication of how much each is able to determine what actually occurs in the relationship. Using the topic following/not following schema, and its index of topic determination, one is able to get a clear indication of where on the complementarity/symmetry continuum as relationship falls.

Another area where the topic following/not following schema proves valuable is its emphasis on who actually defines the relationship or interaction. As stated earlier, the relational coding schema rests on fairly stereotypic definitions of one-up and one-down control moves and these definitions could lead to spurious conclusions with regard to who defines an interaction or relationship. Watzlawick (1964) was sensitive to how easily the terms one-up and one-down could be misconstrued:

> They (one-up and one-down) shall be used here with this understanding: primary, superior or one-up refer to the position of that partner in a complimentary relationship who defines the nature of this relationship, while secondary, inferior or "one-down" refer to the other partner who accepts and goes along with this definition. As can be seen, this has nothing to do with the respective strength or weakness of the partners per se. Indeed, one partner's weakness can easily be the very element by which he defines the relationship as one in which the other is to protect him (p. 7-8).

Topic following/not following centers more on who actually defines the interaction or relationship than the relational schema, which rests on these standard views of strength and weakness. In topic following/not following,

an initiator is credited with attempting control regardless of the manner of attempting control (e.g., giving an order versus a helpless question). Following an initiation, regardless of how this is done (e.g., with instruction or support), is coded as one-down in topic following/not following but not in the relational coding schema. So a major advantage to using the topic following/not following schema, is its reliance on behavioral indicators of who actually defines the interaction or relationship.

The major drawback to the use of topic following/not following is that it is not as complete in its coverage of what goes on in interaction as the relational coding schema. The relational schema has many separate categories of verbal behavior that are used in summarizing interaction. Prior to the coding of directional moves, one has a fairly complete description of the verbal behaviors that transpired between the two participants. Topic following/not following only focuses on topic flow and neglects these other areas of verbal communication. But this lack of completeness is not as great as it would initially seem. First, as topic change is defined, it is not as difficult to achieve as one would believe going by the title topic change alone. Minor or subtle shifts in topic fit the criteria of topic change. If one participant introduces a new aspect to a topic, it often fits criteria for a not following response. Compared to the relational coding schema, relatively little if any information may be lost by rating only with regard to topic following/not following. Relational coding uses the specific categorizing of interaction only as a means of getting at the variable of interest, the control codes. So once these control codes are determined, the more specific codings (three digit codes) are ignored. Further, as mentioned previously, the exact translation of some of these three digit codes into directional codes has dubious validity with regard

to representing who actually defines what occurs. In these cases, the completeness of the relational coding with respect to the three digit codes is of no value as it is translated invalidly into control codes. This is particularly true with the response modes of order, instruction and answer. Of the remaining response modes (i.e., support, non-support, extension, disconfirmation, topic change, and initiation-termination) topic following/not following yields similar conclusions to relational coding. Disconfirmation, topic change and initiation-termination all meet at least one of the criteria of a topic not follow response in the topic following/not following schema and would thus be rated one-up in both schemas. The other relational categories of support, non-support and extension would be categorized as a topic following response. The only major difference in the coding of control attempts here between the two schemas is non-support. Non-support is always one-up in the relational schema but is usually "one-down" in the topic following schema. Non-support, as defined by Rogers and Farace (1975), implies that one disagrees with the previous statement but that the disagreement is of the exact same topic. By non-supporting, the disagreer is stating at the command level that he/she agrees with the other's definition of what the topic is and how it is to be discussed but that he/ she does not agree with the conclusion. Non-support does not appear as indicative of attempting to define the relationship as a topic initiation and thus is not regarded as such in the topic following/not following schema. So, although topic following/not following appears, at face level, to be ignoring much of the verbal interaction in its coding, on closer inspection it is a fairly complete coding schema with regards to actual behaviors that are important to the concepts of complementarity and symmetry. These key concepts that are validly

represented in topic following/not following are those associated with attempts at defining and accepting the definition of the relationship.

Summary

Both coding systems, the relational schema and the topic following/not following schema, are by definition interactional in nature and the resulting codes that are yielded are identical to a large extent. Each coding system rests on the interactional basis inherent in the concepts of complementarity and symmetry. No behavior can be coded in either schema out of the context of the sequential interchanges between the participants. A particular utterance cannot be determined to be one-up, one-down, or one-across, or similarly, following or not following, based on that utterance alone. Each coding system requires rater knowledge of the previous utterance by the other participant so that a response mode can be determined or topic following/not following rated. Without this interactional base, no system could be expected to represent the interactional concepts of complementarity and symmetry.

The major differences between the two coding systems are a) the assumptions used to define control attempts, b) the relative completeness of the rated behaviors and c) the ability to represent the complementarity/symmetry continuum. The relational schema uses a fairly stereotypic concept of control as its basis in determining control moves. Topic following/not following focuses on who actually determines what occurs rather than who might be viewed as controlling what occurs. The two systems will probably yield similar results except in less "normal" relationships as suggested by Haley (1980) and Madanes (1981). In these less "normal" relationships, it would be expected that topic following would yield a more

valid representation of who actually controls than would the relational schema. So topic following/not following would more validly reflect control than relational coding especially in relationships where stereotypic concepts of control are not operative, e.g., psychotherapy. Further, the relational coding schema appears more complete than topic following/not following, but given the questionabe validity of some of the control assumptions, this apparent completedness does not validly capture more of the dimensions of interest, namely, interactional control. And the final difference between the coding schemas, is that topic following/not following gives the user a clear, parsimonious index of the complimentarity/symmetry for any relationship. The means of translating the relational schema codes into a similar index is unclear. Thus the topic following/not following schema has sound validity in representing the abstract constructs of complementarity and symmetry, sufficient specificity of definition and parsimony to be useful to the researcher.

Besides presenting the value of the topic following/not following schema, another goal of this paper was to sensitize the reader to the issues and complexities involved in attempting to operationalize "fuzzy" concepts like relational communication, complementarity and symmetry. Each schema required that many implicit and explicit assumptions be made of the concepts involved in their translation from complex theory to specific variables. The clarity and validity of these assumptions must always be examined. Each coding schema must be evaluated as to the adequacy of the representation of the theoretical constructs as well as the compromise between parsimony and complexity. These are very difficult compromises to strike especially with respect to such complex, theoretical constructs as complementarity and symmetry and may be the reason some

of the original theorists are skeptical that these interactional concepts can be operationalized (Abeles, 1976; Wilder, 1979). Yet attempts at operationalizing are valuable in revealing some of the implicit, underpinnings in the theory and, hopefully, substantiating the theory.

Footnotes

[1]When the concepts of complementarity and symmetry are used to refer to the continuum of relationships anchored at one end by complimentary and the other end by symmetry, the short hand complimentarity/symmetry will be used.

[2]Extensive presentation of this complex coding schema is prohibitive given the purposes of this paper. The reader is referred to the original sources. Further, for the purposes of labeling, this general coding schema will be referred to as the relational coding schema.

[3]The first three criteria were developed by Eldred, Hamburg, Inwood, Salzman, Meyersburg, and Goodrich (1954) and later used by Grater and Claxton (1976). The fourth criteria of level of specificity was developed by Lennard and Bernstein (1960). These four criteria have been applied to psychotherapy interaction by Tracey and Ray (in press) and Tracey, Heck, and Lichtenberg (1981).

References

Abeles, G. (1976). Researching the unresearchable: Experimentation on the double bind. In C. E. Sluzki and D. C. Ransom (Eds.), Double bind: The foundation of the communicational approach to the family (pp. 113-150). New York: Grune & Stratton.

Eldred, S. H., Hamburg, D. A., Inwood, E. R., Salzman, L., Meyersburg, H. A., & Goodrich, G. (1954). The systematic analysis of psychotherapeutic interviews. Psychiatry, 17, 337-345.

Ericson, P. M., & Rogers, L. E. (1973). New procedures for analyzing relational communication. Family Process, 12, 245-267.

Grater, H., & Claxton, D. (1976). Counselor's empathy level and client topic changes. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 23, 407-408.

Gray, L. N., Richardson, J. T., & Mayhew, B. H. (1968). Influence attempts and effective power: A re-examination of an unsubstantiated hypothesis. Sociometry, 31, 245-258.

Haley, J. (1963). Strategies of psychotherapy. New York: Grune & Stratton.

Haley, J. (1980). Leaving home: The therapy of disturbed young people. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Jackson, D. D. (1959). Family interaction, family homeostasis, and some implications for conjoint family psychotherapy. In J. H. Masserman (Ed.), Individual and Familial Dynamics. New York: Grune & Stratton.

Lennard, H. L., & Bernstein, A. (1960). The anatomy of psychotherapy: Systems of communication and expectation. New York: Columbia University Press.

Lichtenberg, J. W., & Barke, K. H. (1981). Investigation of transactional communication relationship patterns. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 28, 471-480.

Lord, R. G. (1979). Leadership valence: A transactional measure of the leadership emergence process? In J. G. Hunt and L. L. Larson Eds.), Cross-currents in leadership. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Madanes, C. (1981). Strategic family therapy. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Mark, R. A. (1971). Coding communication at the relationship level. Journal of Communication, 21, 221-232.

Mayhew, B. H., Gray, L. N., & Richardson, J. T. (1969). Behavioral measurement of operating power structures: Characteristics of asymmetrical interaction. Sociometry, 32, 474-489.

Parks, M. R. (1977). Relational communication: Theory and research. Human Communication Research, 3, 272-281.

Rogers, L. E., & Farace, R. V. (1975). Analysis of relational communication in dyads: New measurement procedures. Human Communication Research, 1, 222-239.

Rogers-Millar, L. E., & Millar, F. E. (1975). Domineeringness and dominance: A transactional view. Human Communication Research, 5, 238-246.

Sluzki, C. E., & Beavin, J. (1977). Symmetry and complementarity: An operational definition and a typology of dyads. In P. Watzlawick and J. H. Weakland (Eds.), The interactional view, New York: Norton.